

EXHIBIT 4

To: The Honorable Board of State Prison Commissioners:

Governor Jim Gibbons; Attorney General Catherine Cortez Masto; Secretary of State Ross Miller

For submission into the Record of the NV Board of Prison Commissioner's Meeting on Tuesday, July 14th, 2:00 PM

Re: Item VII: Discussion/possible action regarding State Administrative Regulations (Attachment 1) - Howard Skolnik, Director.

Reference: AR 813 Psychological Review Panel

For the record, my name is Irene Kane; I reside in Vancouver, BC, Canada and have a family member in the NDOC system in Las Vegas, NV.

I would like to make some comments regarding the above Item VII, AR 813, dealing with the Psychological Review Panel.

It has been my understanding that certain Inmates in the NDOC system must first pass a Psychological Review before being considered for possible parole by the NV Parole Board. I also understand that the Psychological Review is open to both the victim of a crime as well as to the family of the Inmate undergoing the review. One would therefore assume that when an Inmate has passed this Psychological Review, has been so advised of this outcome, as have any family members that were present and no objection has been voiced by the victim and family, that this process then enables the Inmate in question to go to the next step, namely a review for parole by the Parole Board.

Having a loved one in the system, I was of course anxious to hear the outcome of his Parole Review, which followed the successful review by the Psychological Panel last year in August 2008. I had personally spoken to the Chairman of the Parole Board, Dorla Salling, prior to my son's Parole Review and was advised that letters of support from family and friends could be sent to the attention of the Parole Board for their review, as these could be helpful for the inmate's assessment. I was shocked, therefore, when I was advised that the Parole Review was a closed review; that neither the Inmate nor a representative on his behalf was allowed to attend. I keep myself informed of both the Inmate's status as well as to meetings, reviews, etc., of all matters concerning the NV prison system. I was therefore even more shocked when I discovered on the Inmate's status update that a new parole date was listed for 2 years further ahead. The Inmate was not advised until a month later of the denial of his parole, despite the Parole Board's own ruling that such a denial of parole must be given in writing to the Inmate within 10 days of the review with an adequate explanation for such a denial. As I understand it, an Inmate must also be given an opportunity to request another hearing within a reasonable length of time. The written communication that was finally sent to my son indicated only that he was a 'societal risk', but gave no adequate explanation of this comment, which was a contradiction from that of the Psychological Review Panel.

I understand that the backlog of Parole Reviews in 2008 was heavy, but when the Parole Board ignores its own regulations and glosses over the reviews of Inmates so quickly that the Board could not possibly read the submitted letters of Family and Friends nor the submissions by the Inmate himself, which in our case included all courses taken, working inside plus a job offer outside, good behaviour, restitution paid, etc., nor see him face to face, how on earth can they possibly judge whether a person should be eligible for parole or is a risk to re-offend? What does the Parole Board base its judgment on, if not on the recommendation of the Psychological Review Board? It should surely be based on their recommendation, which is the Inmate's progress and behaviour while in the system and an evaluation whether a risk to re-offend. It should not be based on original charges and/or allegations of any kind, but solely on the current situation of an offender during incarceration. In trying to contact the Parole Board via Email through their website or by personal calls, I was unsuccessful in speaking to Ms. Salling again, or to anyone else who could give me any further helpful information, nor did I receive a reply to my email. This is an unacceptable situation; what is the point of having a Psychological Review when their recommendation is ignored and when the resulting Parole Review ignores any submissions from the Inmate himself and those who write on his behalf. I know that that there were many others who were also passed over in this way; these are not isolated situations. Neither a backlog for reviewing the parole of Inmates, nor budget cuts or staff shortage should result in an automatic refusal of a fair parole review hearing and a denial of any Inmates' civil rights.

I would like to recommend that the issue of the Psychological Review Board as well as that of the Review by the Parole Board be addressed and changes made so that a fair hearing is granted to every single Inmate in every Facility in the Nevada Department of Corrections. All Inmates in the system should be given every opportunity to be rehabilitated in order to again become successful members of society once they are released. In order to make this process possible, fair and proper reviews by both Review Boards need to be implemented, with the Inmate or a representative being present at said reviews and allowed to personally speak to the Review Panels.

Thank you for allowing me to make these comments, which, while injected with my personal notes, I sincerely hope will address the issues in the entire NDOC prison system, regardless of the Facility in which any Inmates are incarcerated; it is my hope that such changes to the system will be made on behalf of both the Inmates and their families.

Sincerely submitted,

Irene Kane (mother of an Inmate)

Email: irenekane3@aol.com